



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, September 18, 2009, 1:00 p.m.
122 Ross Hall

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS— Amrhein, Anson, Bailey, Chapman, Clausen, English, Eshleman, Garnett, Giammo, Groesbeck, Ramsey, Vinikas, Webb. CB— Edison, Holland, Nickels, Watts. CE— Bandre, Hayn, Hughes, Kuykendall, Pack. CEIT— Anderson, Chan, Jovanovich, Tramel, Tschumi, Tudoreanu. LAW— Aiyetoro, Fitzhugh, Goldner. CPS— Barnes, Collier-Tenison, Driskill, Faust, Rhodes, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM— Chen, Douglas, Guellich, Kosmatov, McMillan, Prince, Siegar, Tarasenko, Thompson. EX OFFICIO— Anderson, Ford, Smith, Williams.

Absent: CAHSS— Yoder. LIBRARY— Russ. CPS— Robertson. CSM— Perkins, Wright, Yanoviak. EX OFFICIO— Belcher, Davis.

I. Welcome & Roll Call

The president declared it to be 1:00 and convened the meeting. The secretary called the roll.

II. Review of Minutes

The Senate reviewed the minutes of the May 8, 2009, meeting. **Motion and second to accept the minutes. Carried on voice vote.**

III. Announcements

President Ford presented what has become his annual reminder of what it takes to be a senator. It's appropriate, he observed, to stand when you address the body. Elected alternates do not serve as proxies when a senator has to miss a meeting; rather, they assume office if a senator cannot serve.

The president thanked people for their time and for their commitment to the work of faculty governance.

He noted that a proposed policy on Tenure and Promotion passed this body a little over a year ago. The chancellor took it, revised and edited it, and has released a new draft. The president has assigned the draft to the Committee on tenure for review and recommendations to this body, and hopes the Senate will act on it before December.

He discussed the new arrangement of the agenda and the "new topics" item on it. With that item, senators may raise new topics they think need the attention of the Senate in some way. We have used the "open forum" item for this purpose, but attendance has often declined by that time, which makes it not the best way to facilitate the raising of issues.

During "new topics," each person who wishes to raise a topic shall have no more than two minutes to do so, and there will be no discussion at that time. .

Another new item temporarily added to the agenda is “Progress reports on rethinking the bachelor’s degree,” which is a major piece of work for the Senate this year. Ford sees it as having two major parts: one having to do with readdressing the undergraduate core curriculum, and the other having to do with more general requirements for earning a degree, such as issues around residency, number of hours, the minor, and so on.

IV. Introduction of new topics

Watts raised again his question about how scholarship endowment funds are managed. He is seeking more transparency in the process, since his department and others found less than they’d expected when it came time to award student scholarships.

V. Progress reports on “Rethinking the Bachelor’s Degree”

President Ford asked Fred Williams, immediate past president of the Senate and University Assembly, to brief the faculty on the history of the current core.

The following represents the secretary’s notes, and is an inadequate summary of his remarks:

Core curriculum gets caught up in three sets of factors, he thinks. The theoretical, the practical, and the political.

In 1969, there were seven administrative divisions, each of which made curriculum decisions.

There was a great uprising in the 1970s, when we put in place the current curriculum process, establishing the University Assembly. We modeled much of our curriculum development around what UA-F did. Core consisted of Gen Ed plus Pattern 1 or Pattern 2. Business had its own. The core contained courses in social sciences, humanities, hard sciences, and fine arts. Nationally, there was a flood of attention to curriculum in the late seventies. We had ours in place by 1973, ahead of the curve.

Then came the 1980s. Chancellor Jim Young loved things theoretical. “Put it in the bag. Shake it up, and see what comes out.” He established a blue-ribbon committee that came out with nine competencies. The problem was it was so abstract, it was tough to implement with the resources we had.

Blue Ribbon II was Young’s effort to push things on through. It broke away from the “Gen Ed and Pattern(s)” approach, and developed basically the structure we see today.

In the ‘90s, we’ve come back to being both more theoretical and more practical. Blue Ribbon II didn’t deal with languages, for example. We did. Put it in across most degree programs. Gave engineering technology the latitude to design their own requirement.

Where are we now? We hear talk about needing fewer fours for a baccalaureate degree. Some are advocating more hours. He sees the debate being largely driven by considerations related to our very large percentage of transfer students who did not begin their undergraduate journeys with the same expectations as our native students.

Suggested we look at the guidelines of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and in particular at our Self-Study for Institutional Reaccreditation.

President Ford said he doesn’t have a blueprint in mind of how we should tackle rethinking the bachelor’s degree, but thinks there have to be workgroups of some kind out there looking at all the big questions, and that whatever they come up with has to come back to this body.

VI. Reports

Chancellor Anderson

The chancellor noted the arrival of senators who had come since the roll call, and announced that 13,160 to 13,167 is our final enrollment figure. Enrollment growth seems to be something that gets people attention, so he finds a number of people commenting to him about it. Credit is due in a number of areas—we've put increased emphasis on recruiting. There is a large number of concurrently enrolled high-school students, accounting for a significant part of the growth. The chancellor used that as an entrée for a request to those of us who have concurrent-enrollment classes to please make a plan for cherry-picking the very best students from among them.

He thinks we can feel good about the impact of our efforts to ratchet up admission standards. We have deferred a few more than 300 students each of the last two falls, and another 150 the first year, for a total of 750 students, a small but significant percentage. Our thinking was that these deferred students had small likelihood of succeeding, and when they fell away, they would have a bad experience, a bad academic record, and additional debt.

We're also expecting the average ACT score of new admissions to have risen a point from last year, as it did last year from the previous year. It's looking like our efforts to up the standards for admission are working. He expressed his appreciation for the big investment of time on the part of many people to make this happen. And this Senate itself, of course, blessed the plan.

He did remind us that the concurrent enrollment students don't pay tuition, so they don't help on the front end, but they do help on the back end.

At its meeting on this campus a couple of weeks ago, the Board of Trustees of the University of Arkansas System did approve most of the package of bond issues. The housing and sports complex issues will come up later this fall. We must coordinate things so that we can get the residential project ready at the start of a fall semester, and assuming we can make it all fall in place as planned, we look forward to adding another 350+ beds to our on-campus housing.

This morning he greeted some prospective students touring the campus. Good students who are going to be on scholarships see themselves in on-campus housing. To recruit those students, we need to be able to show we have good housing on campus. We do have it; we just don't have enough of it. The new housing project is intended to be honors housing.

He suggested that if there are departmental scholarships we can give to freshmen, it would be helpful if we'd think about how to use those as recruiting tools. We're working to develop more skill and finesse at using multiple scholarship opportunities for focused recruiting.

The North Central visit is coming up, and, he added parenthetically, it's a good thing it only happens every ten years. He thanked all the faculty who were involved in preparing for this.

Q from Chen: About our retention rate, is it true that it's at the bottom in the state? *A:* Yes. *Q:* Are there plans to change that? *A:* Yes. The thing that can have the most impact on retention is admissions requirements. The better the students we admit, the more of them who succeed. He has fussed, he said, and will continue to do so, at the DHE folks about using retention as the measure of success of academic institutions..

He used the example of a 28-year-old pregnant mother of two who enrolls in the fall, optimistic about an October delivery and still being able to succeed as a student. She drops six hours, perhaps even all twelve, in a perfectly rational and responsible decision. Yet DHE under its current policy would take that as a sign that we're not doing our jobs well at the university. Not so, and not fair.

Following the chancellor's remarks, and using his "awesome powers as president" to differ from the published agenda, Ford called on Susan Hoffpauir to report in the provost's spot.

Hoffpauir said that when we started the self-study process, we had four goals: One was to conduct a comprehensive study of our accomplishments toward the goals of Fast Forward, put in place in 2006. We also wanted to update and evaluate the SWOT analysis. Third, we wanted to identify emerging institutional goals. And finally, we wanted to secure reaccreditation for the next ten years. We won't know formally whether we've achieved the last goal until February, but we've done well on the first three.

She was amazed at how well Fast Forward has worked as a strategic plan. The five retention initiatives are in place. We've strengthened advising and have early declaration of major. Our new Office of Transfer Services will articulate all the minutiae of transfer before it reaches faculty. We're enforcing our policy on developmental studies: timely beginning and completion of developmental courses. Usually, our retention of developmental students is at about 30%. Last year, it was 75%.

Emerging issues include the following: Funding. Technology infrastructure. Expanded focus on research and related growing pains. (Fundamental vs. applied research. Research requirements for tenure and promotion. What it means regarding the mission and the traditional focus of the institution on teaching.) Communication among administration, faculty, staff, and students.

A print version of the self study went out to team members on Friday, and the web version is up today. She will also send an e-mail with the link to all faculty, staff, and students. A comments section will be added to the web site. We'll correct the typographical errors on the web-based version, but not more substantive errors or omissions, since the report as it stands is how it was sent to North Central. She noted we are collecting errata, though, so please let her know of corrections that might need to be included.

The North Central team will be here November 2-4. It has eight members, all experienced. They will want to meet with everyone. Most have an area of special interest to them.

In rehearsal for the site visit, Hoffpauir called the Senate's attention to the four elements that comprise the mission of the university: *to develop the intellect of students, to discover and disseminate knowledge, to serve and strengthen society, and to promote understanding of interdependence.* We are a metropolitan university. Everything we do, we do to better society.

VII. Old Business

There was no old business before the Senate.

VIII. New Business

There was no new business before the Senate.

IX. Open Forum

Anson asked if anything is coming forward related to universal design. Chan commented that his memory is that the matter was tabled last spring. Ford acknowledged that things laid on the table stay there until they are removed by motion and affirmative vote.

Eshleman asked if universal design is already being presented as if UALR has adopted the policy. After some discussion, it seemed that where it appears in the Office of Disability Services web sites, it takes the form of a recommendation. For the Senate's purposes, the matter has been tabled, and Ford reminded the Senate that members who wish to get matters on the agenda may bring them forward to the Executive Committee.

Clausen announced UGC deadlines: Curriculum changes coming for implementation in the spring: October 15. For implementation in the fall, March 15.

Ford reminded the Senate that we still have before us the problem of timely notification to all faculty of the actions of both Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. There's a ten-day window during which faculty may raise objection and flag a matter for Senate action. If nothing happens, the actions become policy.

Presently, the Councils publish their minutes and agendas to Council members, to associate deans, and on the web sites. Discussion among senators indicated that information needs to be pushed to faculty. A passive process is not sufficient to alert faculty about pending decisions.

Ford noted that he's taking this matter to both Councils, reminding them of the issues, and asking that they bring forward a plan for wider and timely dissemination of information about decisions and items under consideration.

VIII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Faust, Secretary.

Attachment A

Undergraduate Council Report to Senate, April 10, 2009 *Jeanette Clausen, Chair*

1. Business conducted since my last report on March 13, 2009

- The Council approved new courses, course revisions, and deletions of courses no longer offered for a number of departments and programs, including (in the COB) Economics, Marketing/Advertising, and Management; (in EIT) Systems Engineering; (in CSAM) Math and Statistics, Biology, Chemistry, and Earth Science; and (in AHSS) Theatre Arts and Dance. All the course changes were motivated by the need to update curricula and serve students better. In some cases, the deletion of obsolete courses and the addition of new ones necessitated modifications of the major or minor requirements as well be modified as well. All such changes were made to keep pace with changes in the field, take advantage of faculty expertise, and offer students a better educational experience. In Theatre Arts and Dance, the change to a single alpha code (THEA) for all courses was especially welcome to those who had been bewildered by alpha codes such as DRED, DRAT, DRPE, DRTE, and DRTH. The approved changes will go into the 2009-2010 UALR catalog.

The Council also recommended approval of several **new certificate programs**:

- The Math and Statistic department has developed a new certificate program to provide an Algebra I endorsement Grade 8 for Middle School Teachers. The certificate was developed in response to a request from DHE and meets a need for Algebra-qualified teachers at the Middle School level, since Algebra I is increasingly being taught already in grade 8.
 - The Mass Com department has developed two new undergraduate certificates, a 15-credit Journalism certificate and an 18-credit Professional Certificate in Media Production and Design. Both were created for professionals who need to update their credentials due to the numerous changes in the field of mass communication, especially the convergence of print and electronic news and the prevalence of electronic tools for media production and editing.
2. The Council had a first reading of the proposed revision of the AA in Law Enforcement and expects to see that back on our agenda next week. We are also bracing for a new onslaught of CCFs from various departments that did not have someone to flog them into getting their proposals in early. As always, if you need more information, you can check out our agendas and minutes on the UGC web site.
3. I want to thank the UGC members, both the members elected from the faculty and the ex officio members, who keep the rest of us from falling on our faces. This has been a great group to work with and I thank them for all the work they've done and will still do this year.

This concludes my report.

Attachment B

Comments and Concerns about the Proposed IRB Policy and Procedures

Larry Holland, 4-10-09

I have a few comments and concerns about the proposed IRB policy and procedures. Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the Faculty Senate meeting on Friday, April 10. Therefore, I would like to submit these written comments:

1. The 185-page document is far too large to constitute an effective policy and procedure. I suggest that the document be summarized into a 5-10 page document containing the most critical information. The current document seems to contain extraordinary detail, most of which may well apply to a relatively small portion of the research on this campus.
2. I was unable to find any appeal procedure, any checks and balances, or any allowance for due process if a disagreement occurs between the researcher and the IRB. Indeed, the IRB chair can even restrict a researcher from making an appearance or a statement to the IRB committee. This opens the clear possibility of misunderstandings or even inappropriate and uncontrolled actions by the IRB, which could lead to damaging consequences to the career of an innocent researcher. There needs to be some sort of due process, including an appeal procedure. Also, in the case of a disagreement, a mechanism (or a safeguard) needs to be present that brings to the light of day all relevant issues before any negative action is taken by the IRB.
3. The document needs to spell out carefully the procedures and actions that the IRB Chair, staff, or the committee pursue if an alleged violation occurs. I would like to see involvement with the researcher in trying to work things out before any negative actions are taken, especially any actions that might be damaging to the career of the researcher. This is especially needed if the violation is simply a procedural technicality.
4. There needs to be a clearer statement of research that is exempt from IRB review. The current document requires a much larger process to be deemed exempt. Policy 4.001 on page 85 lists item "2.1 Categories of research *eligible* for exempt status. Then items A, B, and following identify research in educational settings (i.e., pedagogical research), which are exempt from IRB review. However, the Policy 4.001 as a whole requires *all* such research to be reviewed by the IRB. This means an incredible amount of unnecessary paperwork for almost all pedagogical research. Section 2.4 outlines the procedures for filling out a form and submitting the form to the IRB for review and approval. And files must be maintained of potential audit later. All of this apparently applies not just to written documentation of research (articles, etc.) but also to any verbal presentations, which would require prior approvals. Taken to an extreme, even a demonstration or a discussion of best practices would need prior approval (i.e. any ATLE program here on campus) – holding to the requirements of the current document.

There are other issues that I am not clear about within the 185-page document; I only had enough time to document the above items.